



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Unfortunately the circumstances were such that its use in the cause of the émigrés and the non-juring priests was an act of political suicide.

In her use of her material the author occasionally reaches results which are questionable. Speaking of the tumultuous action of the crowd gathered at the Hôtel de Ville on the morning of July 13, 1789, she regards it as a revival of the ancient assemblies of the inhabitants of the commune. This is rather fanciful, and certainly contrary to the implications of the *procès-verbal* from which she quotes. The electors made repeated efforts to send the citizens to their several districts, because their presence at the Hôtel de Ville caused endless confusion. Again, the surprising statement is made that there were at this time in Paris "five hundred thousand commons". If "commons" means men, this is erroneous, for there were only about 680,000 inhabitants. One is puzzled also to discover why in describing the action of the districts on July 13 she has selected as the typical case the meeting of the "Parish" of Saint-Germain-le-Vieil, which was not a district, and which is interesting as an instance of one of the efforts to organize as parishes rather than as districts.

With the exception of the treatment of a few subjects like these, the work is a satisfactory account of the period, pervaded by a sympathetic spirit and showing a desire to describe both incidents and men impartially. The interest of the pages is enhanced by the insertion of several contemporaneous broadsides or cartoons, reproduced from collections in the Bibliothèque Nationale or the British Museum.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

SOME RECENT WORKS ON THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

It is probably true that a larger number of historical works of a high order of merit are put forth each year upon the period of the French Revolution than upon any other equally limited period of European history. The mass of the work is naturally done by French writers, who justly attribute to the great upheaval a preponderant influence in shaping the life of modern France, but not a little of value is being produced by the historians of other countries. The quantity of the output increases each year; and the quality, thanks to the influence of scholars like Aulard and to organizations like the Société de la révolution française, is steadily improving. The plans, now being executed, to study the local history of the Revolution throughout France, combined with the action of the French government in appropriating funds to publish the sources of the economic history of the Revolution, will undoubtedly increase to a remarkable degree the amount of valuable monograph work on the Revolution and hasten the day when a comprehensive and reliable history of the whole movement can be written.

In this rapid review of the publications of the past two years some works will be omitted that have already been considered in the REVIEW. No reference will be made to second editions of some important

works, and even the recent volumes of the source publications by Aulard and others, valuable as they are, must be omitted. For the most part, I shall deal with constructive work alone.

The growing literature upon the history and significance of the Declaration of the Rights of Man has been enriched by three monographs, one by an Italian jurist. In a study on *Montesquieu et J.-J. Rousseau* (Paris, Chevalier-Marescq, 1903, pp. 85), J. Tchernoff notes that the old tendency to oppose Rousseau to Montesquieu is yielding to a tendency to "attach the *Esprit des Lois* and the *Contrat Social* to the same current of ideas, almost to confound the political work of Montesquieu with that of J.-J. Rousseau. It even goes so far as to affirm that Montesquieu is, in certain respects, more of an *étatiste*, more democratic than J.-J. Rousseau, and that the latter, in many passages of his writings, shows himself more conservative than the former." M. Tchernoff treats of the differences between the two writers, due to their methods of research, and of the resemblances in the construction of their theory. He demonstrates that they both made use of elements drawn from the political philosophy of the sixteenth century, and that both reflected the dominant tendencies of the period to which they belonged. He traces the influence of the writings of La Boétie, Bodin, and Hubert Languet upon the political writers of the eighteenth century, and maintains that contemporaries of Rousseau and Montesquieu naturally made this connection between their theories and the theories of the past and saw their relation "to the common fund of ideas existing previous to the Revolution". The bearing of all this upon the discussion of the historical evolution of the French declaration is evident. "The notion of sacred and imprescriptible rights had been affirmed so often since the time of Hubert Languet and Étienne de la Boétie that it very naturally reappeared in the eighteenth century." "Without doubt, the example of the individual states of the United States confirmed the current of ideas that existed, but it did not create it, did not alone contribute to its external form."

La Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen et l'Assemblée Constituante, by Émile Walch (Paris, Jouve, 1903, pp. 240), is the first satisfactory account of the debates in the National Assembly on the Declaration of Rights that has been written. The sources utilized for the study are the best possible, the *Procès-verbaux*, the newspapers, the *Courrier de Provence*, the *Point du Jour*, the *Journal des États généraux* of Le Hodey, and the originals of some fifteen projects of declarations. M. Walch has produced a well-balanced monograph that fills a real gap in the literature of the Revolution. In an appendix he examines the influence of the American declarations of rights on the French declaration. His conclusion is that a considerable influence must be attributed to the declaration of Virginia (1776).

The third of these studies, *La Dichiarazione dei Diritti dell'Uomo e del Cittadino nella Rivoluzione Francese*, by Dr. Giorgio del Vecchio

(Genoa, Gioventù, 1903, pp. 93), although printed separately, was conceived as a part of a larger work, soon to be published, that will treat more in detail the historical precedents of the French declaration. The study is a philosophical one, beginning with an examination of the connection between the Declaration of Rights and the French Revolution, in which the writer makes clear that the violent character of the outbreak was due to historic conditions and not to the metaphysical character of the declaration. The second and third chapters deal with the historical and philosophical presuppositions of the declaration and the various forms of the Declaration of Rights in the successive moments of the Revolution. The fourth chapter traces the history of the criticism of the declaration from Burke to the present time and shows a familiarity with the most important works upon the subject in English, French, German, and Italian. Perhaps the most interesting chapter is the last, in which Dr. Giorgio treats of the positive efficacy of the Declaration of Rights and its significance in the modern state. The hostility of critics has not interfered with the historical efficacy of the declaration; its ideas have penetrated profoundly the judicial conscience of all modern civilized peoples. If these principles have to-day become commonplaces, it is nevertheless true that it was due to their adoption that the *Stato di diritto* has taken the place of the arbitrary and policed state.

Two volumes upon the religious history of the Revolution, one by M. A. Aulard, *La Révolution Française et les Congrégations* (Paris, Cornély, 1903, pp. 327), the other by M. Edme Champion, *La Séparation de l'Église et de l'État en 1794* (Paris, Colin, 1903, pp. xiii, 282), were probably—the first one certainly—called forth by recent political events in France, but this fact in no way lessens their scientific value. M. Aulard publishes the texts of the decrees abolishing the congregations, reconstructs, from the *Procès-verbaux* and the most reliable contemporary newspapers, the debates upon the orders, and prefixes to the collection an excellent introduction of forty-three pages in which he traces the history illustrated by his sources. The book will prove to be a most helpful one to students who do not have access to such newspapers as *Le Journal* of Le Hodey, the *Chronique de Paris*, the *Point du Jour*, the *Procès-verbaux*, and the rare pamphlets of the Bibliothèque Nationale. It is a model of what such books should be. M. Champion calls his volume “an introduction to the religious history of the Revolution”, “une course très rapide et très courte, à travers un sujet immense”. Beginning with chapters on “The National Religion” and “Gallicanism”, he traces rapidly, in a series of luminous chapters, the relations between church and state during the Revolution to the passage of the decree of September 18, 1794, that formally declared the separation of the two. Although the book is only an introduction, “une vue à vol d'oiseau”, M. Champion knows his sources and keeps in close touch with them. To such an extent is this true that he frequently

presents old problems in a new light, so that even the specialist on the religious history of the Revolution may derive some benefit from a reading of his excellent sketch.

Five years ago (1900), M. Paul Ardascheff published a volume in Russian upon *Les Intendants de Province sous Louis XVI*. It was so favorably received that he decided to publish the second volume of the work in French and translate the first volume into the same language, thus making them generally accessible to historians. Neither of these volumes has yet appeared, but M. Ardascheff published last year a third volume in French, composed of *pièces justificatives* (Dorpat, Mattiesen, 1904, pp. xi, 554), evidently the material upon which his first volume was based. In other words, it is a source-book on the intendant on the eve of the Revolution. The sources are both manuscript and printed. The former are drawn chiefly from the Archives Nationales and the Archives Départementales de la Marne; the latter from volumes new and old, some of them easily accessible. There are clearly two ways in which this volume may be approached, with a feeling of gratitude or with a feeling of wonder. One ought to feel grateful for a book of this kind, and a person that knows how to study documents will find it of inestimable value; but as the appendix to a work of erudition why, we wonder, has the author reprinted page after page from such easily accessible works as the *Archives Parlementaires*, the *mémoires* of Argenson, Bertrand de Moleville, Besenval, Bouillé, Bailly, and a dozen others, together with documents reproduced from works printed in the last ten or fifteen years? From the point of view of a final study on the intendant, the book for which this volume supplies the proof would certainly be open to severe criticism; in the mind of the reader of this evidence too many questions arise that cannot be answered by the evidence that M. Ardascheff has given us, but could be answered by a more thorough examination of the archives. In his rapid transit, as he describes it, through the archives of southern France, it is doubtful whether he could have done justice to their contents. It is hardly fair, however, to pass judgment upon a book that one has not seen, and for my own part I am very much inclined to subordinate the attitude of wonder to that of gratitude in approaching this interesting and valuable collection of sources.

Les Débuts de la Révolution dans les Départements du Cher et de l'Indre (1789-1791), by M. Marcel Bruneau, has already been reviewed (IX, 165-166). It is a model of what a local history should be, local history in the setting furnished by the larger revolution. Here is a volume that fills one with respect and admiration for modern French historical scholarship. The bibliography of thirty-eight closely printed pages, devoted largely to the enumeration of the manuscript material contained in national, departmental, and local archives is proof that M. Bruneau has exhausted his sources in the preparation of his work. A sober, scholarly narrative that follows the evidence and avoids no

inferences, even when unfavorable to the revolutionary movement, opens with the elections for the States-General and closes with an exhaustive chapter on the civil constitution of the clergy.

Condorcet has waited long for a biographer, but as if to repay for this seeming neglect two excellent lives appear at almost the same time, the first by M. Franck Alengry, *Condorcet, Guide de la Révolution Française, Théoricien du Droit Constitutionnel et Précurseur de la Science Sociale* (Paris, Giard et Brière, 1904 [1903], pp. xxiii, 896), the second by M. Léon Cahen, *Condorcet et la Révolution Française* (Paris, Alcan, 1904, pp. xxxi, 593). As a history, the volume of M. Cahen is the better piece of work, but it is far from rendering the work of M. Alengry antiquated. The writers conceive their tasks in different fashions. M. Alengry, treating Condorcet as "guide of the Revolution", divides his stout volume into two parts. In the first a brief account of the writings of Condorcet is given in a chronological order, accompanied by an enumeration of only the most indispensable historical facts; in the second and larger part the ideas of Condorcet are presented, grouped in logical order under the heads, "Condorcet Théoricien du Droit Constitutionnel ou Étude raisonnée des Principales Théories Constitutionnelles de Condorcet", "Condorcet, Précurseur de la Science Sociale, ou l'Économie Politique, la Morale et la Sociologie chez Condorcet", and "Originalité et Influence de Condorcet". It is this second part that is the most valuable portion of the work of M. Alengry. He has read nearly everything that Condorcet wrote and has grouped his material skilfully. A very full table of contents increases the usefulness of the book.

The volume of M. Cahen is of a different order and higher rank. Documentation, criticism of the sources, and construction offer little opportunity for adverse criticism. In his search for manuscript material he not only examined the public and private collections in Paris and the provinces, but even extended his investigations to Geneva and Berne. In the printed sources he makes excellent use of a long list of contemporary newspapers, together with official documents, pamphlets, and *mémoires*. He has evidently utilized the best of the secondary works touching his subject. The narrative is not only a satisfactory account of the rôle of Condorcet in the Revolution, but even casts light upon many important events that had not hitherto been satisfactorily treated, as for example the attitude of the Legislative Assembly toward the king during the summer of 1792. M. Cahen has also introduced in their proper places studies upon the political theories of Condorcet and his ideas upon public education.

The life of the Duc de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, by Ferdinand-Dreyfus, has already been reviewed in the REVIEW (X, 411-412). It may not, however, be out of place to call attention to the thoroughgoing research that forms the basis of the work and has furnished us with a volume that does not fall into the class of ordinary biographies, but is

likely to be the standard work upon this interesting Revolutionary character for years to come. Just as the work of M. Cahen will prove valuable to students of education in France during the Revolution, so the life of La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt will furnish material to the sociologist and the student of charities. Notice should also be taken of the *Correspondance Inédite de La Fayette, 1793-1801, Lettres de Prison, Lettres d'Exil, Précédée d'une Étude Psychologique* (Paris, Delagrave, [1903], pp. 389), by M. Jules Thomas, which contains fifty-six letters, some forty of which are published for the first time; the others have been either incorrectly or incompletely published. The letters are introduced by a "psychological study" of a hundred pages. It is suggestive and interesting, although the general opinion will probably be that it contains more psychology than history.

The larger part of the fourth series of *Études et Leçons sur la Révolution Française* (Paris, Alcan, 1904, pp. 317), by M. Alphonse Aulard, is devoted to Danton. Although these studies, beginning with the "Jeunesse de Danton", combined with studies previously published by M. Aulard, would form a fairly complete and continuous biography, the writer makes no such claim for them. His purpose is twofold: to submit the published evidence upon Danton to a searching criticism, "dissipating the loyal benevolent legend" that has formed about him, and to make public additional evidence that M. Aulard has encountered in the course of his investigations. Many of the pleasing anecdotes concerning Danton's childhood, products of a subconscious imagination, turn out to be fables; the importance of the rôle that he played in the Revolution previous to August 10 is shown to be far less than his biographers have claimed. The real character of the rôle is rendered clearer by fresh evidence carefully combined but with no effort to elicit more information than it was capable of supplying. Danton suffers little by this stripping process; he remains one of the most attractive characters of the Revolution.

Four important contributions have been made to our knowledge of the life of Mirabeau. M. Paul Cottin has published two volumes of the letters of Sophie de Monnier to Mirabeau¹ and prefixed to one of these a study upon "Sophie de Monnier et Mirabeau" that is probably final work for that important episode in Mirabeau's life. The correspondence upon which the monograph was based was partly in cipher, the key to which was discovered by M. le commandant Bazeries. The cipher, the key, and a facsimile page of one of the letters form a part of the documentary material of the volume, together with a portrait of Madame de Monnier and a photograph of a bust of Mirabeau, both made public for the first time. The bust of Mirabeau, a very excellent

¹ *Sophie de Monnier et Mirabeau, d'après leur Correspondance Secrète Inédite (1775-1789)*. Par Paul Cottin. (Paris: Plon. 1903. Pp. cclx, 287); *Lettres inédites de Sophie de Monnier à Mirabeau (1775-1781)*. Publiées par M. Paul Cottin. (Paris: Aux Bureaux de la Nouvelle Revue Rétrospective. 1903. Pp. 351.)

one, represents him at about the age of thirty. The second volume of letters contains another portrait of Sophie de Monnier, taken at the age of twenty. These two volumes of letters form a necessary supplement to the letters of Mirabeau to Sophie, published in 1792 with the title *Lettres originales de Mirabeau*. Written for Mirabeau alone, they give us an insight into the real character of Sophie de Monnier—an insight better than we can get into the sentiments of Mirabeau from his letters, which were written with the knowledge that they would be read by the police. Sophie de Monnier does not lose nor does Mirabeau gain anything by this fresh light thrown upon their relations. It results from the work of M. Cottin, supported by a study of the portraits, that the attachment of Madame de Monnier was something more than an ordinary liaison, that she was devoted to him heart and soul, and that Mirabeau finally abandoned her without cause. Of her infidelity there is not a particle of truth. Mirabeau's influence upon Sophie de Monnier was both good and bad. She possessed a keen, active mind, which responded quickly to the constant impulses to thought received from Mirabeau: on the other hand, her life with Mirabeau ruined what little religious belief she may have had and developed the lower side of her nature. The responsibility of Mirabeau in inducing her to prepare a circumstantial account of their amours is clearly established. Whatever her faults may have been, Sophie de Monnier was much sinned against.

The *Lettres à Julie*,¹ published by M. Dauphin Meunier in collaboration with M. Georges Leloir, is a combination of sources and narrative. These letters, written from Vincennes to a woman whom he had never seen and finally ending in a love-affair, constitute some of the most remarkable evidence upon the life and character of this extraordinary man. The brilliantly written chapters, in which M. Meunier endeavors to clear up the mystery that Mirabeau threw around his relations with Madame de Lamballe, and to give the historical setting to the correspondence, make a definite contribution to the understanding of the character of Mirabeau. The "Épilogue" contains in half a dozen pages one of the keenest, fairest, and most sympathetic sketches of Mirabeau's character that I have ever read. The second appendix, or "Dictionnaire alphabétique des noms propres", of more than one hundred pages in double columns, is one of the most valuable parts of the volume. It represents a large amount of painstaking research and will form an indispensable aid to the student of Mirabeau's life.

The fourth volume of the Mirabeau group, *Mirabeaus geheime diplomatische Sendung nach Berlin* (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1901, pp. viii, 202), by Dr. Erich Wild, appeared in 1901, but has not received the attention that it deserves. A volume by Henri Welschinger upon the

¹ *Lettres à Julie, Écrites du Donjon de Vincennes par Mirabeau*. Publiées et Commentées d'après les Manuscrits Originaux et Inédits par Dauphin Meunier avec la Collaboration de Georges Leloir. (Paris: Plon. 1903. Pp. iii, 467.)

same subject (Paris, 1900) was reviewed at some length in this REVIEW (VI, 235-253); Wild's monograph not only corrects the work of Welschinger, but renders it antiquated and proves its unreliability. The comment of Wild (p. 197) that "Diese gesammte Textpublication Welschingers"—supposed to be the original text of the *Histoire secrète*—"ist nun völlig unbrauchbar und in so unglaublicher Weise angefertigt, dass Welschinger nicht gewusst haben muss, worauf es bei seiner Aufgabe ankam, da Oberflächlichkeit und Unaufmerksamkeit bei der Arbeit allein nicht erklären, warum das Originalmanuskript so sehr selten und auch dann nur unexact benutzt wurde", is literally true, and not the carping criticism of one who is preparing the same text for publication. But a small part of Dr. Wild's volume—six pages in an "Excurs"—is devoted to the criticism of the publication of Welschinger; the major part (144 pages) deals with the origin of the mission to Berlin, the original letters written by Mirabeau, the rewriting by Talleyrand, the publication of the letters by Mirabeau, and the different editions. It is a most satisfactory piece of work, displaying unusual critical skill and powers of combination. The most noteworthy part of the book is chapter v, in which Dr. Wild by a comparison of the manuscript with the published text settles forever the question of Mirabeau's responsibility in the matter of publication. The outcome of the matter is summed up in this sentence: "Das Manuskript war aber, wie wir sahen, von Mirabeau selbst in der Absicht der Herausgabe verändert und dazu vorbereitet worden." The assumption of Dr. Wild that Mirabeau made but one copy of his correspondence from Berlin, an assumption that he made use of in discussing the question as to whether Mirabeau attempted to sell the correspondence to Montmorin, is incorrect. I found in the Arsenal Library last summer a second incomplete copy, which at one time must have been complete, judging from the promise to send the rest that is upon one of the sheets.

There are one or two general observations that I feel impelled to make in concluding this summary review. The first is that none of these volumes is the work of a dilettante, a mere literary exercise, but the result of serious research and critical study of all the documents. It is by such work alone that history can hope to establish its claim to be looked upon as a science. The second observation concerns the predominance of the purely scientific point of view that characterizes this work, the spirit of detachment, so difficult to attain in dealing with things human. Naturally the ideal has not been reached, but one feels that a wonderful advance has been made by Frenchmen, in the past thirty years, toward this ideal, even when dealing with the living question of the Revolution. Last of all, the superior quality of the work and the unusual quantity that is being done on this period of French history, taken in connection with what French historians are doing on other periods of the world's history, naturally leads us to inquire whether France is not recovering in these matters the primacy that she lost a hundred years ago.

FRED MORROW FLING.